

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-25 were pending in the application. Claims 13-25 have been withdrawn. Claims 1 and 10 have been amended. Claim 11 has been canceled. New claim 26 has been added. Support for new claim 26 may be found, among other places, on page 11 of the specification. Therefore, claims 1-10 and 12-26 are now pending in the application. Reconsideration of the application is requested for at least the reasons that follow.

**Information Disclosure Statements**

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's acknowledgement of the Information Disclosure Statement and Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement, both filed June 10, 2004, and the claim for foreign priority.

**Specification**

The Office Action objects to the specification for failing to include a Cross-Reference to Related Application section on page 1 of the application. The related application is the basis of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119 and, as such, is not required to be included in the Cross-Reference to Related Applications section of the specification. Moreover, the Application Data Sheet filed December 9, 2003 contains a reference to the foreign priority document. *See* 37 C.F.R. 1.78(a)(2)(iii). Therefore, Applicants have not amended the specification to include the Cross-Reference and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection.

The Office Action further objects to the specification for including the reference to "FIG. 1" in the Abstract. This Amendment amends the Abstract to remove the reference to "FIG. 1," thus overcoming the objection.

**35 U.S.C. 112**

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Office Action states that "the phrase 'if required' renders the claim indefinite." Office Action at p. 2. Applicants have amended claim 10 to remove that phrase (and otherwise clarify the claim) and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by DE 196 00 348 (“Lewecke”). Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to contain the subject matter of claim 11. Claim 1, as amended, recites a method for loading a glass processing installation comprising, among other things, “step a) extracting at least partially a glass plate ... step b) dividing the glass plate into a residual portion ... and wherein at least one glass plate ... is provided with at least two different scribing lines before performing step b.”

The rejection of amended claim 1 should be withdrawn at least because Lewecke does not teach or suggest each and every recitation of the claim. For example, Lewecke does not teach or suggest the method of independent claim 1, which requires that “at least one glass plate ... is provided with at least two different scribing lines before performing step b.” The Office Action states that “Lewecke is silent on sheets being scribed before dividing the sheets.” Office Action at p. 4. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1.

Claims 2-10 depend from claim 1 and are allowable therewith, for at least the reasons set forth above, without regard to the further patentable subject matter set forth in these dependent claims.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejections

Claims 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewecke in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,277,889 (“Oberg”). Claim 11 has been canceled and the subject matter incorporated into independent claim 1, with a revision. Claim 12 depends from claim 1. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection for at least the following reasons.

The rejection should be withdrawn at least because the Office Action does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Lewecke and Oberg, taken separately or together, do not teach or suggest all of the limitations of independent claim 1. For example, neither of the references teaches or suggests the claimed method in which “at least one glass

plate ... is provided with at least two different scribing lines before performing step b.” The Office Action states that “Lewecke is silent on sheets being scribed before dividing the sheets.” Office Action at p. 4. The Office Action states that Oberg “discloses glass cutting means by which sheets being scribed before being divided,” and refers to col. 1, lines 10-20 of Oberg. Though col. 1 of Oberg makes reference to “scribed lines,” it is not clear whether it is referring to one line per glass sheet or multiple lines per glass sheet. Another portion of the disclosure of Oberg (col. 3, line 33 to col. 4, line 4) teaches away from the present invention by disclosing a glass sheet being scribed with only one line before being broken.

In contrast, claim 1 requires a method in which “at least two scribing lines” are provided before dividing the glass plate. This permits (but does not require) an embodiment of the claimed invention to achieve the advantage that the glass processing installation can be fed with a predetermined sequence of loading portions that are already scribed. Thus, the loading portions do not need to be moved to additional positions for a scribing operation, but only for a breaking operation. *See* Application at p. 12, lines 17-29. Neither Lewecke nor Oberg teach or suggest the claimed method of loading a glass processing installation. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 11 (now incorporated into claim 1) and claim 12.

New claim 26 depends from claim 1 and is allowable therewith, for at least the reasons set forth above, without regard to the further patentable limitations set forth in this dependent claim.

#### Conclusion

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or

Appl. No.: 10/730,015

Atty. Dkt. No. 068754-0292

even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date April 25, 2005

By  (Reg. No. 38,072)

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 22428  
Telephone: (202) 945-6014  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

for  
George C. Beck  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 38,072